

Application Serial No: 10/627,144
In reply to Office Action of 7 March 2006

Attorney Docket No 83634

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 are currently pending in the application. No claims have been allowed. As such, claims 1-19 are rejected by this Office Action. Claims 1-6 and 14-19 are amended by this response and claims 7-13 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

These rejections and objections are respectfully traversed in view of these amendments and remarks that follow.

In the Office Action, claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In response, claims 7-13 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; therefore, the rejection of the Office Action is resolved for these claims. In regard to claim 1, upon which claims 2-5 depend, the claim has been amended to recite a step of collecting data, incorporating the data into a structural relational database and providing a graphical user interface that allows a user to manipulate and selectively display a current status of a third party customer. As such, the amended claim clearly claims the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention; therefore, the rejection of the Office Action is resolved for amended claim 1 as well as amended claims 2-5.

Application Serial No: 10/627,144
In reply to Office Action of 7 March 2006

Attorney Docket No 83634

In response and in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, claim 1 has been amended to recite "collecting data ... new, in-process, and completed jobs/tasks" and therefore provides antecedent basis for the recitations of claim 3. As such, the Office Action is resolved for amended claim 3.

In regard to claim 6, upon which claims 14-19 depend, the claim has been amended to recite a system with a means for collecting data, storage records for the collected data; user-definable queries for allowing a user to query the storage records and a computer for maintaining the storage records. As such, the amended claim clearly claims the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention; therefore, the rejection of the Office Action is resolved for amended claim 6 as well as amended claims 14-19.

In the Office Action, claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,970,475 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,148,291 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,901,377. In response, claims 7-13 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; therefore, the rejection of the Office Action is resolved for these claims.

In regard to claim 1, upon which claims 2-5 depend, the claim has been amended to recite a step of collecting data, incorporating the data into a structural relational database and providing a graphical user interface that allows a user to

Application Serial No: 10/627,144
In reply to Office Action of 7 March 2006

Attorney Docket No 83634

manipulate and selectively display a current status of a third party customer. In regard to claim 6, upon which claims 14-19 depend, the claim has been amended to recite a system with a means for collecting data, storage records for the collected data; user-definable queries for allowing a user to query the storage records and a computer for maintaining the storage records.

The advantage of the present invention is that a reasonably skilled user can build programs when assigned tasks. Specifically, the present invention utilizes the concept of the cited references yet creates a novel approach that allows an unskilled manager (production controller, engineer, or business) to design his/her interface for their specific customer requirements. In contrast, the cited references are indications of the skill set of the reasonably skilled person to an individual goal and in some cases a process.

For an organization, such as a military organization, the need is not just satisfied by an individual material movement system (such as the Rad reference, U.S. Patent No. 6,148,291) or a single repair job (such as the Rosenfield reference, U.S. Patent No. 6,901,377). The need could be any combination of duties, a typical request could be that the paying customer is only interested in knowing how long a repair activity keeps his/her repair before returning the item. Another customer

Application Serial No: 10/627,144
In reply to Office Action of 7 March 2006

Attorney Docket No 83634

could only request the final cost and would schedule work on a repetitive basis and quantity of good/bad results, and yet would require all of the above.

The collected data associated with the present invention allows feedback for repair trends, cost trends and the best utilization of expenditures. It is not the collected data in itself as it is the flexibility to allow the managers of data to define their interface to accomplish their duties by the customer (no one product can serve all needs) and to provide the least amount of "data clutter".

The databases can be designed to allow total separation of collected data so that customer privacy can be contained if a customer desiring privacy requests to utilize the invention. Many of the cited references are fixed to one application and do not offer the flexibility of meeting customer requirements without the extensive rewrite of their code. The present invention utilizes a root template of data inputs for collection that can copy with each new customer and if necessary be adapted with minor coding to accommodate unique issues, but rarely if necessary since all the data input requirements are based on populating supporting dynamic data boxes with customer specific requirements and only unique reports may be required to be created.

Application Serial No: 10/627,144
In reply to Office Action of 7 March 2006

Attorney Docket No 83634

Based on the differences in data input and user interface/utilization described above, it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the cited references to produce the method of amended claim 1 and the system of amended claim 6. As such, the rejection of the Office Action under 35 USC 103 is resolved for amended claim 1 and dependant claims 2-5 as well as for amended claim 6 and dependant claims 14-19.

In the Office Action, claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,970,475 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,148,291 and U.S. Patent No. 6,901,377 as applied to claim 6 and further in view of U.S Patent No. 6,990,482. In response, claim 7 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; therefore, the rejection of the Office Action is resolved for this claim.

In the Office Action, claim 10 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,970,475 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,148,291 and U.S. Patent No. 6,901,377 and further in view of U.S Patent No. 6,990,482. In response, claim 10 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; therefore, the rejection of the Office Action is resolved for this claim.

In view of the Remarks above, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the application.


Application Serial No: 10/627,144
In reply to Office Action of 7 March 2006

Attorney Docket No 83634

The Examiner is invited to telephone Michael P. Stanley;
Attorney for Applicants, at 401-832-4736 if, in the opinion of
the Examiner, such a telephone call would serve to expedite the
prosecution of the subject patent application.

Respectfully submitted,
WILLIAM J. HELMS

8 May 2006

By 
MICHAEL P. STANLEY
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 47108